

REMARKS

Claims 5, 21, 38-40, 47, 48 and 51 are amended as illustrated in the foregoing section **Amendments to the Claims**. Claims 1-4, 6-20, 22-37, 44, 45, 50 and 52-59 are canceled. Accordingly, Applicant submits claims 5, 21, 38-43, 46-49 and 51 for further examination. Applicant respectfully asserts that in light of the claim amendments and following remarks, claims 5, 21, 38-43, 46-49 and 51 are now in condition for allowance.

Discussion of Claim Amendments

The limitations of claims 19 and 20 have been incorporated into claim 5 and similar limitations introduced into claim 51. All other independent claims have been canceled.

Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Office Action indicated claims 1-8, 13-43, 45-52 and 54-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. 2002/0032751 to Bharadwaj ("Bha").

The examiner considers that at [0061], [0112] Bha teaches receiving a HTML media file and that at [0169], [0828], and [0835] streaming media to the client is taught. The examiner also considers that at [0656] resizing an object on a client screen is taught.

Applicant submits that amended claim 5 now requires (**emphasis added**) a server configured to

download data with **constant compression rates** to a user's machine to enable an HTML media file to be displayed with real-time streaming on a display device of the user's machine,

convert the HTML media file from a media format to a **universal media format agreed between the server and the user's machine**,

receive the **resolution requirement of the display device**,

resize the HTML media file to be able to be **fully displayed** on the display device **according to the received resolution requirement before sending** the HTML media file to the user's machine.

Applicant submits that at the very least Bha does not teach the above emphasized portions of claim 5. Particularly there is no teaching or disclosure of constant compression, no agreement on a universal media format, no receiving the resolution requirement of the display device, no resizing at the server to optimize for the received resolution before sending the file. For example

Application No.: 10/511,773
Filing Date: October 19, 2004

Bha teaches directly away at [0656] by doing resizing locally at the client screen. In view of the amendment to claim 5, Applicant respectfully asserts this objection is moot.

Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Office Action indicated claims 9-12 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 6,189,051 to Oh et al.

In view of the cancellation of claims 9-12 and 53 this objection is moot

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, the Applicants are not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. The Applicants reserve the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that the Applicants have made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Conclusion

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and that the claims now be found in condition for allowance.

Any claim amendments which are not specifically discussed in the above remarks are not made for patentability purposes, and it is believed that the claims would satisfy the statutory requirements for patentability without the entry of such amendments. Rather, these amendments have only been made to increase claim readability, to improve grammar, and to reduce the time and effort required of those in the art to clearly understand the scope of the claim language.

Application No.: 10/511,773
Filing Date: October 19, 2004

Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns that might prevent the prompt allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: June 5, 2008

By: Gregory A. Hermanson
Gregory A. Hermanson
Registration No. 53,018
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20995
(619) 235-8550

5296843/cfn/051608